

Apr. 29. 2009 4:32PM

RECEIVED
CENTRAL FAX CENTER

APR 29 2009

No. 3534 P. 1

400 Garden City Plaza - Suite 300
Garden City, New York 11530
(516) 742-4343 - Telephone
(516) 742-4366 - Facsimile
e-mail: intprop@ssmp.com

**SCULLY, SCOTT, MURPHY
& PRESSER**

Fax

- RESEND -

To:	Examiner Tariq S. Najee-Ullah Group Art Unit: 2456 571-273-8300	From:	Eunhee Park
Fax:		Pages:	9 (including fax cover sheet)
Phone:		Date:	April 29, 2009
Re:	Brian S. McCain, et al. U.S. Serial No. 10/796,489 Docket: TUC920030184US1 (17306)	CC:	

INTERVIEW REQUEST

Comments:

May 4, 2009

Applicant requests an interview with the Examiner for ~~May 4, 2008~~ to discuss items in the attached draft amendment.

Please do not hesitate to contact us if you have any questions.

CONFIDENTIALITY: The documents accompanying this facsimile transmission may contain information which is either confidential or legally privileged and is intended only for the authorized use of the individual or entity named above without right or publication or republication, dissemination or disclosure except as expressly set forth or established by course of dealing. All rights are reserved. If you are not the intended recipient, you are hereby notified that any disclosure, copying, distribution or use of the contents of this facsimile is prohibited. If you received this transmission in error, please notify us immediately by telephone to arrange for return of the documents.

If you have any problems concerning this facsimile, please call (516) 742-4343 and ask for Vivian Henriquez.

Apr. 29. 2009 4:32PM

RECEIVED
CENTRAL FAX CENTER No. 3534 P. 2

APR 29 2009

DRAFT

IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

Applicants: Brian S. McCain, et al. **Examiner:** Tariq S. Najee-Ullah
Serial No.: 10/796,489 **Art Unit:** 2152
Filed: March 5, 2004 **Docket:** TUC920030184US1 (17306)
For: **APPLICATION OF THE
COMMAND PATTERN TO
A CLIENT/SERVER APPLICATION**

Confirmation No.: 3039 **Dated:** **DRAFT**
Commissioner for Patents
P. O. Box 1450
Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

RESPONSE UNDER 37 C.F.R. § 1.111

Sir:

In response to the final Office Action dated February 2, 2009, applicants respectfully request reconsideration of the present application and claims in view of the following amendments and remarks.

Listing of claims begins on page 2 of this paper.

Remarks begin on page 5 of this paper.

CERTIFICATION OF ELECTRONIC FILING

I hereby certify that this correspondence is being deposited with the United States Patent and Trademark Office via Electronic Filing through the United States Patent and Trademark Office e-business website, on DRAFT.

Dated: DRAFT

DRAFT

F:\IBM\1545\17306\Amend\17306.am3.doc

Listing of Claims:

1. (Previously Presented) A method for use by a client host in providing a networked application with a server host, comprising:

using a command pattern to encapsulate instructions and first data into a command object; and

providing the command object to the server host;

wherein the server host executes the instructions in the command object to provide second data, based on the first data, in the command object, and returns the command object with the second data to the client host, and

wherein said command pattern is applied in a graphical user interface and the server host executes the instructions in the command object without knowledge of the first data and the purpose of the command.

2. (Previously Presented) The method of claim 1, wherein:
the second data provides a reference to a resource.

3. (Previously Presented) The method of claim 2, wherein:
the resource comprises a database.

4. (Original) The method of claim 1, wherein:
the command object is a single object.

5. (Original) The method of claim 1, further comprising:
interpreting the second data in the returned command object.

6. (Original) The method of claim 1, wherein:
the instructions include instructions for processing the first data to obtain the second data.

7. (Previously Presented) A program storage device tangibly embodying a program of instructions executable by a machine to perform a method for use by a client host in providing a networked application with a server host, the method comprising:

using a command pattern to encapsulate instructions and first data into a command object; and

providing the command object to the server host;

wherein the server host executes the instructions in the command object to provide second data, based on the first data, in the command object, and returns the command object with the second data to the client host, and

wherein said command pattern is applied in a graphical user interface and the server host executes the instructions in the command object without knowledge of the first data and the purpose of the command.

8. (Previously Presented) The program storage device of claim 7, wherein:
the second data provides a reference to a resource.

9. (Original) The program storage device of claim 8, wherein:
the resource comprises a database.

10. (Original) The program storage device of claim 7, wherein:
the command object is a single object.

11. (Original) The program storage device of claim 7, wherein the method further comprises:
interpreting the second data in the returned command object.

12. (Original) The program storage device of claim 7, wherein:
the instructions include instructions for processing the first data to obtain the second data.

13. (Previously Presented) A method for use by a server host in providing a networked application with a client host, comprising:

receiving a command object from the client host;
wherein a command pattern is used by the client host to encapsulate instructions and first data into the command object;
executing the instructions in the command object to provide second data, based on the first data, in the command object; and
returning the command object with the second data to the client host, and
wherein said command pattern is applied in a graphical user interface and the server host executes the instructions in the command object without knowledge of the first data and the purpose of the command.

14. (Previously Presented) The method of claim 13, wherein:
the second data provides a reference to a resource.

15. (Original) The method of claim 14, wherein:
the resource comprises a database.

16. (Original) The method of claim 13, wherein:
the command object is a single object.

17. (Original) The method of claim 13, wherein:
the client host interprets the second data in the returned command object.

18. (Original) The method of claim 13, wherein:
the instructions include instructions for processing the first data to obtain the second data.

REMARKS

Reconsideration of the present application, as amended, is respectfully requested.

Claim rejections – 35 U.S.C. §112

Claims 1, 7 and 13 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §112, first paragraph as allegedly failing to comply with the written description and enablement requirement because of the terminology “without knowledge of the purpose of the command”. Those claims are further rejected under 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph as allegedly being indefinite because of the same terminology. Applicant respectfully disagrees.

The specification in paragraph [0012] discloses that “The command pattern is an object-oriented design pattern that describes a pattern for encapsulating instructions and data into a single object, called a command.” That paragraph further discloses, “A command can be passed around to different components of a software application, and then executed as needed.” Paragraph [0012] continues to disclose, “The other software start the execution of the command...” The specification in paragraph [0013] also explains, “The command object contains data, as well as the instructions to process the data. When the server receives the command object from the client, it simply executes the command instructions, then returns the command itself back to the client with new data.” The specification in paragraph [0014] also describes, “the server does not need to know anything about the raw data it receives from the client. If a new client type is added, the server does not need modification since the client will still be sending commands that the server can execute....The invention allows for flexibility in the client/server application by allowing new client types and versions to be added that can still communicate with old servers. This can be understood by noting that a command is an abstract

data types, in this case, an object. The server knows how to process commands, in the abstract sense. It receives a command, executes it (passing any necessary resources in), then sends the command back. A new command could be created that the server never saw before, yet the server could still handle it and process it, even if the server does not know anything about the clients." The specification further includes example pseudo codes for implementing such commands and command objects starting in paragraph [0016]. Because at least those paragraphs provide sufficient written description and enablement for executing a command "without knowledge of the purpose of the command," applicant believes the Examiner's rejections under section 112 are improper. Accordingly, the Examiner is respectfully requested to withdraw those rejections.

Claim rejections – 35 U.S.C. §103

Claims 1-18 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 6,065,053 to Nouri et al ("Nouri") in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,851,105 to Coad et al. ("Coad").

Nouri and Coad do not disclose or suggest every element claimed in independent claims 1, 7 and 13 as amended. For instance, Nouri and Coad fails to disclose, suggest or teach at least, "the server host executes the instructions in the command object without knowledge of the first data and the purpose of the command" claimed in claims 1, 7 and 13.

Nouri as understood by applicants discloses resetting a server. The cited passages Nouri appears to disclose recovery manager software that provides a microcontroller network command that has a communications protocol around the command to a server. While Nouri uses the terminology "encapsulated command" to describe its microcontroller network command

that has the communications protocol around it, Nouri still fails to disclose an object having a command and first data in which, "the server host executes the instructions in the command object without knowledge of the first data and the purpose of the command." Rather, as it appears in Nouri's column 14, lines 46-47, Nouri's server knows what the command is for and accordingly powers-on the server.

The Examiner particularly cites Nouri's Fig. 3 that shows a protocol message format. However, as the Examiner concedes, Nouri's message format is not a command that is executed. The cited passages of Nouri (e.g., col. 12, lines 63 – col. 13, line 28) also appear to require knowing the type of command, i.e., a WRITE or READ command, in order to determine whether or what to execute.

Coad is of no help in that respect. Coad as understood by applicants discloses generating a pattern. The cited passages of Coad refer to the software development tool that supports the definition of a pattern. Coad in the Abstract discloses that the software development tool receives an indication of a pattern, generates software code reflecting the pattern, and stores identification information for the pattern. Thus, Coad also must have the knowledge and purpose of the pattern. Coad, therefore, also fails to disclose or suggest, "the server host executes the instructions in the command object without knowledge of the first data and the purpose of the command."

On the other hand, independent claims in the present application recite using a command pattern to encapsulate instructions. A command pattern as explained in the specification on page 3, paragraph [0012] is an object-oriented design pattern that describes a pattern for encapsulating instructions and data into a single object, called a command. A command can be passed around to different components of a software application, and then executed as needed. For example,

components that receive a command can execute the command without knowledge of the data or the purpose of the command.

For at least the reasons set forth below, independent claims 1, 7 and 13, and their respective dependent claims 2-6, 8-12 and 14-18 at least by virtue of dependency, are not obvious over the cited references. The Examiner is, accordingly, respectfully asked to reconsider and to withdraw the rejection of claims 1-18 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) and to allow claims 1-18.

This communication is believed to be fully responsive to the Office Action and every effort has been made to place the application in condition for allowance. A favorable Office Action is hereby earnestly solicited. If the Examiner believes a telephone conference might expedite prosecution of this case, it is respectfully requested that the Examiner call applicant's attorney at (516) 742-4343.

Respectfully submitted,

DRAFT

SCULLY, SCOTT, MURPHY & PRESSER, P.C.
400 Garden City Plaza, Suite 300
Garden City, New York 11530
(516) 742-4343